

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
EASTERN DIVISION

BILLY W. TRILLET,

Plaintiff,

V.

LEE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER, et al., )

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:05-CV-694-F  
WO

## RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action in which the plaintiff, Billy W. Trillet, challenges the medical treatment provided to him during his confinement in the Lee County Detention Center.

Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that the Lee County Detention Center should be dismissed from this cause of action prior to service of process in accordance with the directives of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).<sup>1</sup>

## DISCUSSION

The plaintiff names the Lee County Detention Center as a defendant in this cause

<sup>1</sup>A prisoner who is allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this court will have his complaint screened in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This screening procedure requires the court to dismiss a prisoner's civil action prior to service of process, regardless of the payment of a filing fee, if it determines that the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary damages from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii).

of action. A county detention facility is not a legal entity subject to suit or liability under section 1983. *Cf. Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir. 1992). In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that the plaintiff's claims against the Lee County Detention Center are due to be dismissed. *Id.*

### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that:

1. The plaintiff's claims against the Lee County Detention Center be dismissed prior to service of process pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. The Lee County Detention Center be dismissed as a defendant in this cause of action.
3. This case, with respect to the plaintiff's claims against defendants Burk and Stewart, be referred back to the undersigned for appropriate proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that on or before August 16, 2005 the parties may file objections to this Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which the party is objecting. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and advisements in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation shall bar the party from a de novo determination by the District Court of issues covered in the Recommendation and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the Recommendation accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981, *en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

DONE, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2005.

/s/ Susan Russ Walker  
SUSAN RUSS WALKER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE